DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 391 154 CS 012 344

AUTHOR Sinha, Shobha; Janisch, Carole
TITLE A View of Reading Practices in the Intermediate Grades: Treatment of Discourse Types. Technical Report No. 629.
INSTITUTION Center for the Study of Reading, Urbana, IL.
PUB DATE Nov 95
NOTE 17p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Intermediate Grades; *Reader Text Relationship; *Reading Instruction; Reading Processes; Reading Research; *Reading Strategies; Research Needs; *Text Structure
IDENTIFIERS Text Types

ABSTRACT

Two theoretical perspectives are woven together to frame an approach to classroom reading instruction. Viewing reading instruction from a literary perspective and a psychological perspective has the potential to help students understand the distinctions between different text types and the various purposes for reading--information, enjoyment, and emotional engagement. Three vignettes describe actual intermediate-grade reading lessons, specifically focusing on practices relevant to the theories. To help students achieve a high level of engagement and understanding, the classroom reading program needs to incorporate both the literary perspective and the psychological perspective. Studies to explore the use of pseudo-fiction or even novels in teaching content may be needed. More work needs to be done to examine the state of classroom practices in terms of discourse force and the adoption of stance. (Contains 21 references.) (Author/RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 391 154

Technical Report No. 629

A VIEW OF READING PRACTICES IN THE INTERMEDIATE GRADES: TREATMENT OF DISCOURSE TYPES

Shobha Sinha
Western Illinois University

Carole Janisch
Texas Tech University

November 1995

Center for the Study of Reading

TECHNICAL REPORTS

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

College of Education
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN
174 Children's Research Center
51 Gerty Drive
Champaign, Illinois 61820

CS012344

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF READING

Technical Report No. 629

A VIEW OF READING PRACTICES IN THE INTERMEDIATE GRADES: TREATMENT OF DISCOURSE TYPES

Shobha Sinha
Western Illinois University

Carole Janisch
Texas Tech University

November 1995

College of Education
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
174 Children's Research Center
51 Gerty Drive
Champaign, Illinois 61820

Abstract

Two theoretical perspectives are woven together to frame an approach to classroom reading instruction. Viewing reading instruction from a literary perspective and a psychological perspective has the potential to help students understand the distinctions between different text types and the various purposes for reading--information, enjoyment, and emotional engagement. The report includes a description of classroom reading instruction and ways the theories relate to observed practices.

A VIEW OF READING PRACTICES IN THE INTERMEDIATE GRADES: TREATMENT OF DISCOURSE TYPES

We read for a variety of purposes--for information, for enjoyment, for emotional engagement. Good readers are aware that different types of texts lend themselves to these different purposes (Beach & Appleman, 1984). Therefore, classroom instruction that helps students learn about different text types can contribute to their development as good readers.

In many classrooms, teachers do not emphasize differences in text types and purposes for reading (Rosenblatt, 1980). All texts, informational texts as well as stories, are treated the same, and the activities that accompany reading--answering questions, completing worksheets, writing definitions of vocabulary words, and sequencing story events--are used only to promote the short-term goals of skill development and reading comprehension.

As a result, some students may come to view reading as an activity confined only to the classroom setting. Such students are not likely to become life-long readers who engage in functional, relevant, and interest-based reading. Rather, they may come to view reading as an onerous task. For other students, the practice of focusing only on comprehension and engaging in the same activities for different types of text creates confusion and takes them away from an understanding of the everyday purposes for reading. Although many students develop an awareness of text distinctions independent of the classroom reading program, there are many others who rely on classroom programs for development of this awareness. A classroom program should be designed to help all students understand the everyday purposes for reading.

A good reader needs to make certain distinctions about text types and purposes for reading. This report discusses two theoretical perspectives: literary and psychological. We believe the theories can be the basis for classroom reading instruction to help students make the distinctions. Combining the two, we apply the theories to classroom practices and consider issues of text selection and treatment of text types. We present three vignettes that describe actual intermediate-grade reading lessons, specifically focusing on practices relative to the theories. We conclude with some recommended classroom practices and suggestions for future research.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Text Types

Literary text types and expository text types constitute the two major types of discourse structures. Literary as defined here, does not refer to *literary* only in terms of classical literature. Rather, these types encompass a broad category of text types. Generally, literary text types serve to entertain, and expository text types serve to inform. Novels, stories, and poetry fall into the category of literary text types, whereas description, comparison, causation, and persuasion are among the expository text types (Beach & Appleman, 1984). That is not to suggest there is a one-to-one relationship between discourse type and purpose; rather, the distinctions indicated generally apply.

Description of the Theories

The two perspectives, literary and psychological, differ in their approach to reading (e.g., unlike literary theories, psychological theories tend to deal with a wide variety of texts, including popular forms of literature). Yet, two theories derived from these differing perspectives make similar points about the purposes of reading as related to text types. From a literary perspective, Rosenblatt (1978) proposed

the transactional theory wherein the reader adopts a stance that results in purposeful reading. From a psychological standpoint, Brewer (1980) advanced the idea that the study of discourse is incomplete without attending to the underlying purpose of the text which he terms the *discourse force*. Although Rosenblatt talks about the reader and Brewer talks about the text, the theories are complementary to each other in that they both address purposes for reading.

Rosenblatt's (1978) theory relates more closely to the reader. She believes that very early in the reading events, a reader adopts a particular stance. According to Rosenblatt, purposes for reader exist on a continuum ranging from a "predominantly efferent stance" to a "predominantly aesthetic stance." When a reader chooses a "predominantly efferent stance," her purpose is to carry away or retain information *after* the reading event (Rosenblatt, 1978, 1989). Meaning results from an analytic structuring of the ideas, information, directions, conclusions to be retained, used, or acted on after the reading event. An example of efferent reading might be an individual reading accounts of the American Civil War to learn and understand the political and social events that lead to the war. When a reader chooses a "predominantly aesthetic stance," she adopts an attitude of readiness to focus attention on what is being lived through *during* the reading event. Meaning results from the sensations, images, feelings, and ideas that are the residue of past psychological events involving those words and their referents. An example of aesthetic reading is the reading of a mystery story purely for enjoyment and suspense.

Readers need to be aware of the textual cues that help them adopt a stance (Rosenblatt, 1989). A text indicates to the reader the type of stance that might be adopted. Early in the reading event, a strategic reader uses the textual cues to help her select the stance. Visual arrangements (e.g., those that indicate the text is a poem), linguistic cues, headings, and subtitles can influence a reader in the selection of a stance (Rosenblatt, 1989). Thus, the reader's adoption of a particular stance determines the type of meaning constructed from the text and is seen as reflecting the reader's purposes.

Brewer's (1980) theory relates more closely to the text. Historically, psychologists who studied written discourse tended to view all types of discourse as a means of imparting information. This narrow view of the intent of discourse overlooked the existence of different discourse types that readers encounter in everyday reading. In contrast, Brewer offers a more comprehensive theoretical framework for considering the different types of discourse. His classification scheme is based on the nonlinguistic cognitive structure underlying the written discourse *and* the "force" of the discourse. Based on the underlying representation, he identifies three types of discourse: descriptive (the underlying form is visual spatial), narrative (the underlying form is a series of coherent events), and expository (the underlying form is abstract logical processes). In addition to structure, the classification of written discourse requires a construct of discourse force. Brewer identifies four types of discourse force: to inform (author's intent is to give information), to entertain (author's intent is to amuse, frighten, excite), to persuade (author's intent is to persuade or convince), and literary-aesthetic (author's intent is to provide an aesthetic experience for the reader, i.e., the discourse is approached as a work of art). Using his scheme, a selection about the American Civil War would be considered an exemplar of expository discourse, while the main discourse force is to inform. A novel of the American West would be classified as narrative discourse, while the main discourse force is to entertain. The reader's purpose is reflected in her understanding of the discourse force.

Similar to Rosenblatt, Brewer gives an account of the reader's use of surface structure; that is, surface structure can offer cues for the type of discourse and the discourse force (Brewer, 1980). For example, expository discourse based on underlying logical structures tends to be organized with terms such as *thus*, *because*, *since*. Vocabulary choices can also serve as a surface cue for discourse force. In the following statements, it would appear that the intent is to inform: "Thousands of miles of scenic America separate the Atlantic Coast and the Pacific Coast." In contrast, the intent to entertain may be the discourse force if one were to read the statement: "Bumping along the intestate highways with two

small, restless children and one large, restless dog, we tried in vain to take in America's natural wonders."

Interested in affective outcomes, Brewer and Lichtenstein (1981, 1982) specifically applied the notion of discourse force to stories (structural-affect theory). Moving from a focus on story grammar, taking into account only the temporal order of events in a story, Brewer and Lichtenstein, believing tat stories were more to entertain than inform, paid attention to the discourse force of stories by differentiating between the event structure and the discourse structure. They suggested that the author of a story manipulates the order of the actual events in the story, thus giving rise to different affective outcomes, for example, surprise, suspense, and curiosity. The manipulation of events along with linguistic devices and literary conventions gives rise to the discourse force. Unlike story grammar, the structural-affect theory captures the affective states that a story can create in the reader.

At this point some clarification about terminology is necessary. Brewer's use of the term literary-aesthetic pertains to *serious literature* while his term *entertainment* describes the more popular forms of written discourse. Rosenblatt does not discuss the popular forms of texts. Her use of the term *aesthetic* applies to "a lived-through experience," which can comprise an emotional experience as well as literary appreciation. We can argue that the discourse force to entertain and literary-aesthetic in the text can give rise to an *aesthetic* stance in the reader. Similarly, the discourse force to inform can give rise to an *efferent* stance. Rosenblatt does not discuss the discourse force to persuade.

As noted earlier, the two theories are complementary. Although Brewer's term *discourse force* directly refers to the author's purpose and Rosenblatt's term *stance* refers to the reader's purposes, nonetheless, both are talking about the purposes of reading.

Text-Based Factors

Brewer (1980) indicates a problem with his classification: There is not a one-to-one relationship between discourse type and discourse force. First, written discourse is not homogeneous. A work may contain smaller units of different discourse types, for example, descriptive discourse may be embedded in narrative discourse. Second, discourse force for a specific genre is not stable. Within the same genre (e.g., western novels), some texts may have an overall force to entertain and some may have an overall force of literary-aesthetic. This critique notwithstanding, Brewer's theory helps conceptualize the purpose of reading.

Rosenblatt's (1989) theory accounts for the coexistence of both stances; she defines them not as dichotomies, but as two ends of a continuum with readers taking a *predominantly* efferent or a *predominantly* aesthetic stance. The question is not one of whether both stances can exist simultaneously, but one of determining which is predominant. Many texts give rise to both kinds of stance, and readers may change their stance during reading. For example, an informative text about travel destinations might at some point give rise to an aesthetic stance where the reader would feel emotional engagement with the places described. On the other hand, a novel about the American West might intrigue the reader with its informative aspects about the geology of the mountain regions and give rise to an efferent stance. Moreover, a reader may choose to read a text with a stance that does not match the intent of the text. For example, in a zoological text, the images that are evoked and the elegance of the writing could create an aesthetic response as well as yield information (Rosenblatt, 1989). Taking a stance other than the one indicated by the text is acceptable when the decision is a conscious one on the part of the reader. Awareness of different options is an important attribute of a good reader.

According to Brewer, discourse can have simultaneous forces. A biography can both entertain and inform; it is not a case of one segment having one force and another a second force. One segment of

discourse can give rise to multiple forces. Just as a mature reader may consciously choose a singular stance, she may impose a discourse force other than the one intended by the author. Take the case of some government documents that contain convoluted syntax and semantics. Reading these documents may serve to entertain. Although this force does not reflect the author's intent, the reading is not wrong. It does not undermine the theory because the reader is not confused about the purpose. She knows that these tracts are not meant to entertain; this force is deliberately imposed on the text.

The Reader's Role

Following from the preceding discussion, literary text types would be read with a primarily aesthetic stance and expository text types would be read with a primarily efferent stance. Taking this position implies that there is a right and a wrong way of reading that reverts back to the point of view espoused by New Criticism, the view that meaning resides in the text. However, Rosenblatt chose the term *transaction* to define the reading event, suggesting that both reader and text are important. Transaction carries "overtones of mutuality, a blending of components" (Rosenblatt, 1985, p. 98); a transaction is something that happens between the reader and the text. Although the choice of stance is based on the text, there is not a supremacy of text over reader. The reader is a creator of meaning but within the constraints of the text. Brewer's classification scheme raises a similar question, that is, is there a right way of reading text? Although discourse force, as discussed, relates to the intent of the author, Brewer acknowledges that the force extracted from discourse is actually aa complex interaction between the intent of the author and the intent--and the assumptions--of the reader.

Both Rosenblatt and Brewer express concern about theorists' and researchers' general disregard for discourse types and the tendency to use all texts as information imparting devices regardless of their purpose. According to Rosenblatt (1980), classroom reading programs tend to reflect an efferent bias. Because they typically reflect information to be taken away, it is generally appropriate to read expository text with an efferent stance. On the other hand, literary texts are written for other purposes. In general, they are less appropriate for taking away information or adopting an efferent stance. Unfortunately, the adoption of an aesthetic stance for reading literary text types is often not an option for students in the classroom.

Summary

Rosenblatt and Brewer believe that attention needs to be given to the purposes for reading. Attending to the discourse force of the text or adopting a stance would lead a reader closer to the actual purposes for reading. In our view, if these aspects of text and reader are overlooked, an individual is merely focusing on what we term "the surface level information of the text" or the literal information readily located in the surface elements of the text.

Although both perspectives underscore the interaction of reader (the reader draws on her knowledge/experiences) and text, textual constraints affect the reader's adoption of stance and determination of the discourse force. Adopting a stance other than the one indicated by the text is acceptable when it is a conscious decision made by the reader. Similarly, a reader may elect to read for purposes other than those intended by the author. The purposes established by the reader may be based on her own experiences. For example, a reader who has personally experienced a flood would read an expository text about flooding conditions with not only the purpose of taking away information but also with a "lived-through" emotional involvement unlike that of an individual who had not experienced such an event.

Literary text types generally have a discourse force of either entertaining or providing a literary-aesthetic experience while the stance would be predominantly an aesthetic one. With expository text, the discourse force will generally be one of informing while the stance is an efferent one. In both cases,

purposes for reading are underscored. However, in theorizing, rigidity in matching discourse types to purpose should be avoided. It is possible for a reader to choose to read an expository text for entertainment or for a literary-aesthetic experience, or to read a literary text for information. However, if a reader chooses to read all texts for the same purpose, there is a problem in light of these two theories. The disregard for the existence of various text types and an efferent bias of classroom reading programs can mislead a student regarding the reasons for reading.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE CLASSROOM READING PROGRAM

To help students understand the purposes for reading, attention to the discourse force of different text types and the adoption of stance become important considerations. When classroom reading discussions and activities promote understanding of these aspects of reading, students can be assisted in a move toward becoming eager and independent readers. In this section, we briefly review the treatment of these issues in a classroom setting. We consider two important aspects of a classroom reading program: texts selected for classroom use and the treatment of these texts in the classroom context.

Texts

Attention to the quality of the texts should form an integral part of the reading program in the classroom setting. Basal readers and content area textbooks constitute a major part of the reading material used in the classroom. However, these textbooks are not without criticism. The literary text types (particularly the stories) in basal readers are structured for the purpose of teaching reading skills and comprehension (Beck, 1984). Authentic texts, as opposed to texts written for and narrowly confined to use in classroom reading instruction, are more suitable for inclusion (see Edelsky & Draper, 1989, for a discussion of authenticity). Lacking any complexity or points of genuine interest, basal stories may possess only weak elements of the discourse force (e.g., entertainment and/or a literary aesthetic experience). Stories with only weak elements of force will not be helpful to students in selecting a stance. It should be noted that more attention is currently given to incorporating children's literature into classroom reading instruction (Cullinan, 1987). Inclusion of quality literary text types in classroom reading programs can be attributed, in some degree, to the impetus of the whole language movement (Newman, 1985; Watson, 1989).

The structure of expository text types used in schools has also been criticized. The quality of the writing and the presentation of information does not always enable the reader to easily take away information. Not all texts are *considerate* (Anderson & Armbruster, 1984). For example, texts may not be appropriate for the intended audience or reflect unity, coherence, and a structure that best conveys the informative purpose (e.g., compare/contrast, cause/effect). Although texts in content area textbooks are closer to the discourse force of informing, the weaknesses found in their structure may hinder students' learning and retention of information, important purposes for reading.

Treatment of Texts

In classroom reading programs, two aspects of reading a story have been given special attention: comprehension and structure. Structure is actually linked to comprehension; understanding story structure aids comprehension (Stein & Glenn, 1979). When teachers use stories in the classroom, they focus on comprehension by facilitating students' understanding of the story structure through question and answer activities, discussion of content, and summarization. Story mapping is also an activity which aids in understanding story structure. What seems to be missing is attention to the discourse force of stories. That is, there is little discussion of entertainment and/or literary-aesthetic experiences (e.g., the affective outcomes) in reading a story.

The efferent bias that pervades the classroom is illustrated by Rosenblatt's (1980) anecdote about a classroom situation. She observed a teacher asking the students during a poetry reading lesson, "What facts does this poem teach you?" The purpose of a poet writing a poem about birds, for example, is not primarily to impart information. Rather, the intent is to give rise to affective states, and classroom activities could be designed to reflect that intent.

Because it is appropriate to read expository texts with an efferent stance, this text type fares better in the classroom as far as the treatment of discourse force is concerned. It is here that structure is an important consideration. Focusing on the structural aspects of texts facilitates learning and remembering information (Armbruster, Anderson, & Ostertag, 1987; Taylor & Beach, 1984). However, as pointed out, expository text that is *inconsiderate* can be problematic: Students may find it difficult to take away important information.

In short, we can say that the reading program, particularly in relation to the literary text types, does not pay attention to the discourse force and all text types are treated in the same manner in the classroom.

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

Guided by the theories outlined, we conducted an exploratory study to determine how the different discourse types, namely expository and literary, were treated in the classroom reading program. Eight reading lessons, which ranged in time from one-half hour to an hour, were observed by both authors. Field notes were taken and all reading materials used in the sessions were collected. We focused on the intermediate grades where it seemed that students should begin to understand the distinctions we've outlined and to apply them to their own reading behaviors. To illuminate the treatment of text types, we offer vignettes of three classroom reading settings. One lesson focused on treatment of an expository text type and two lessons focused on literary text types. We do not make any claims of describing the overall state of instruction practices in the field of reading. We merely attempted to see how the theories of text types work in the classroom context and to gain some direction for future research.

Vignette One

The activities in a combined fifth- and sixth-grade class centered around a text about two children going to visit their grandparents in Florida. Enroute they meet someone who tells them about manatees. This individual talks about characteristics of the manatee and the conditions that threaten its survival. At the conclusion of the text, the two children join a club to save the manatees. The purpose for reading this story is actually to learn about manatees and possibly to learn about endangered species and the concept of extinction. The discourse force of this text is to inform and, hence, the stance should be primarily efferent. There could be emotional involvement if the readers felt strongly about the issue of extinction.

However, although imparting information about manatees appeared to be the purpose of the text, the cues provided in the text may leave the reader doubtful as to its actual intent. The structure of the text is that of a story. The early cues in the text along with its story format suggest an aesthetic stance. However, if we look beneath the structure and examine the content, the intent of the text or the discourse force is to inform; therefore, an efferent stance on the part of the reader is suggested. The purpose for reading this text is to learn about manatees. This type of text is potentially confusing as far as the issue of discourse force and stance is concerned. Students may be more familiar with the story format, and one could reason that acquiring information through stories may be appropriate. Flood (1986) suggests, however, that students need to make the transition from narrative to expository text through the use of subject matter textbooks and classroom practices appropriate to these texts.

During our observation, the children read the text and completed the worksheet entitled "Map of the Story" related to the story. The first part consisted of title, place, characters, and time of year. The

purpose was clearly to outline the setting. The second part consisted of 9 items, each labeled as an *event*, which helped reconstruct the story. There was a question corresponding to each event. Some examples follow.

Event 1:	Why were R and B going to Florida?
Event 2:	Who did they meet on the plane?
Event 6:	What are mammals?
Event 7:	What are some other kinds of water mammals?
Event 8:	What did the manatees by the power plant look like?
Event 9:	Why did Sally say manatees were in danger of becoming extinct?

Items 6 through 9 with their "events" and questions are particularly interesting. It is evident that these questions have been mislabeled. The so-called events are not actually events. The term *event* suggests a temporal sequence typical of stories, whereas the questions are actually descriptions of the animal.

Although there is nothing wrong with the questions themselves, the format of their presentation further confuses the issue of text purposes. A more reasonable approach would be to focus attention on what R and B learned about the manatees, for example, characteristics of the animals, their endangered status, and the role individuals can assume in saving the manatee. What is of importance is not a chronology of events, but information and conclusions to be retained after the reading event. The accompanying worksheet could have included questions that reflected the actual purposes of the text.

Vignette Two

Activities in a sixth-grade class focused on the use of a literary text type. The students were reading *White Fang* by Jack London (1989). This novel can be clearly described as authentic. It is widely acclaimed and has high emotional content. Therefore, the stance should be primarily aesthetic. The discourse force is to entertain and/or literary-aesthetic. The students had read chapters prior to class, and during our observation the class discussed the gruesome fight involving the lynx, the she-wolf, and the gray cub. The scene described was a violent one and, among other emotions, it created fear and disgust.

The content of the class discussion can be divided into three categories: reproducing surface information (literal information readily located in the text), sequencing and evaluating events, and eliciting an aesthetic response.

1. Reproducing surface information. Some examples include: "What is the purpose of the journey?" "Who outwitted him?" "What happens to the plan?"

2. Sequencing and evaluating events. Examples include: "What happened first?" "What was the most important event?"

3. Eliciting an aesthetic response. Although the text had high emotional content there was only one instance when a child initiated a discussion of that element. He said, "I felt sick when I read it." The teacher responded, "Not sick but sad." The discussion was then terminated.

An analysis of this lesson reveals that the text selection was good in terms of its potential for emotional response. However, reproduction of surface information and sequencing of events may only assist in literal understandings and reflect purposes of "producing surface level information."

Although the high emotional content of the text afforded opportunities for an aesthetic response, this was limited by teacher control. The only evidence for inclusion of the readers feelings was the reported discussion. Unfortunately, this discussion was teacher dominated and came to an abrupt ending. The inclusion of evaluation was a positive sign; the evaluation of events can help in appreciating the text. However, there was not much opportunity for students to personally respond to questions such as "What was the most important event?" Only one response--out of many possible responses--was elicited.

The lesson illustrates two points. First, the mere choice of authentic text does not necessarily lead to the adoption of stance. Second, the teacher did not pay attention to the discourse force of the novel, nor did she validate the expressed response of the reader.

Vignette Three

In a fifth-grade classroom, we observed a lesson based on another novel, *Sounder* by William Howard Armstrong (1989). The novel is based on the struggles of an impoverished African-American family. The discourse force of the novel is literary-aesthetic, and the stance suggested would be predominantly aesthetic.

Based on the chapter they had read, the students were asked to generate two questions. The lesson was not highly structured, and there were no guidelines for formulating the questions. Students formed groups and each group was directed to present one question for the general discussion. The questions generated by the students and the subsequent discussions between the teacher and children can be divided into three categories: reproduction of surface information (literal information readily located in the text), inferential questions, and background questions.

1. Reproduction of surface information. Questions included: "Who is Sounder?" "Did he find Sounder?" "How did Sounder live?"

2. Inferential questions. In this case the teacher added to the children's questions to make an exercise in inferencing. For example, one student asked, "What kind of pants did he wear?" The children responded with laughter. The teacher inquired why this question was important to the story. She elicited the fact that the quality of clothes indicated that the family was poor.

3. Background questions. Students and teachers entered into a discussion about the term, *sharecropper*. One child asked if the family lived on welfare. The teacher situated the story in a historical context by stating that it was before the existence of welfare programs.

The analysis of this reading lesson reveals some interesting points. Even though the teacher gave children the opportunity to generate their own questions, most of the questions were superficial and children did not choose to infuse their feelings about the story into their questions. Although there were some questions that referred to the poverty element in the story, the teacher's comments merely situated the story in an historical context. No references were made to the reader's feelings regarding the meaning of poverty nor to its emotional outcome for the characters. Even though there were questions such as "Why was he laughed at?," there was no discussion of the feelings and emotions of the characters. Here again we observed the use of an authentic text--with the potential for students to adopt an aesthetic stance--in a primarily efferent manner.

PURPOSES FOR READING AND A VIEW OF CLASSROOM PRACTICES

To help students achieve a high level of engagement and understanding, the classroom reading program needs to incorporate both the literary perspective and the psychological perspective. Teachers need to make students aware of different text types and different reasons for reading. Making students aware of these distinctions presupposes two crucial elements for the intermediate-grade reading program: careful selection of texts and a recognition that readers read for different purposes.

It is important that the selected texts and their classroom usage afford students the opportunity of adopting a stance. In the vignettes, we illustrated two problems that can arise with respect to text selection. First, authentic texts were chosen, but the students were not allowed to take a stance suggested by the text. Classroom teachers used literary texts to engage students in a literary experience, but the purpose of reading, as noted by the questioning, became narrowed to what we call "reproducing the surface information of the text." Students in the observed setting were oriented to these purposes, established by the teacher, and only took away names of characters and "surface information." From an observation of these classroom practices, a "lived-through" aesthetic experience was not an option for students.

It could be argued that information was taken away--the adoption of an efferent stance--but we suggested that the definition of efferent implies *useful* information. Accordingly, students should be assisted in their efforts to take away well-organized and useful information from expository text. The use of well-written texts and an awareness of text structure or expository text can facilitate the adoption of an efferent stance.

Second, texts were chosen that are not clearly literary text types nor clearly expository text types. In the first vignette we pointed out that an expository text was presented in a story format, and the discussion encompassed both story elements (e.g., characters) and information. The worksheet accompanying this text created further confusion regarding the purposes for reading. The purpose of this text was to offer information; however, this type of text structure *and* the treatment observed may hinder students in their adoption of an efferent stance.

In summation, including authentic texts in the classroom reading program is not enough. These texts need to be treated in a manner that encourages children to pay attention to the discourse force and to adopt a stance appropriate to the intent of the author. Using both theoretical perspectives, we believe it is important for a reader to consider the text type and the purposes of the text. The danger in taking this position is that it could lead to rigid classroom reading practices. That is not our intent. Our intent is to validate the reader and acknowledge the experiences she brings to the reading event, and at the same time, help her toward an understanding that reading is both for entertainment and for information. Reading outside the classroom is carried out for these genuine and authentic purposes, reading inside the classroom can do no less.

RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS

The study suggests two lines of research.

1. Text Research: Studies to explore the use of pseudo-fiction or even novels in teaching content may be needed. In our study, the use of pseudo-fiction seemed to be the most puzzling with regard to purposes for reading. The question arises as to how these types of text should be used in the classroom. Although it is likely that this form of writing has the advantage of familiarity for the child, it might prove to be confusing to the child due to its blending of purposes. Experimental research might be designed

to determine which is more effective: providing information through expository forms or providing information through pseudo-narrative forms.

2. Classroom Research: More work needs to be done to examine the state of classroom practices in terms of discourse force and the adoption of stance. Qualitative studies are needed to compare teachers' and students' purposes for reading inside and outside the classroom. It is likely that teachers may be aware of the actual purposes of reading and adoption of stance outside the classroom but lose sight of it in the unique "culture of the classroom." Further, an examination of levels of story comprehension and story interpretation is needed. How a reading program can help students move beyond the surface information to other important goals needs to be studied.

References

Anderson, T. H., & Armbruster, B. B. (1984). Content area textbooks. In R. C. Anderson, J. Osborn, & R. J. Tierney (Eds.), *Learning to read in American schools: Basal readers and content texts*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Armbruster, B. B., Anderson, T. H., & Ostertag, J. (1987). Does text structure/summarization instruction facilitate learning from expository text? *Reading Research Quarterly, 22,* 331-346.

Armstrong, W. H. (1989). *Sounder*. New York: Harper Collins.

Beach, R., & Appleman, D. (1984). Reading strategies for expository and literary text types. In A. C. Purves & O. S. Niles (Eds.), *Becoming readers in a complex society* (pp. 115-143). Chicago: NSSE.

Beck, I. (1984). Developing comprehension: The impact of the directed reading lesson. In R. C. Anderson, J. Osborn, & R. J. Tierney (Eds.), *Learning to read in American schools: Basal readers and content texts* (pp. 3-20). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Brewer, W. F. (1980). Literary theory, rhetoric, and stylistics: Implications for psychology. In R. J. Spiro, B. C. Bruce, & W. F. Brewer (Eds.), *Theoretical issues in reading comprehension* (pp. 221-239). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Brewer, W. F., & Lichtenstein, E. H. (1981). Event schemas, story schemas, and story grammars. In J. Long and A. Baddeley (Eds.), *Attention and performance IX* (pp 3663-379). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Brewer, W. F., & Lichtenstein, E. H. (1982). Stories are to entertain: A structural affect theory of stories. *Journal of Pragmatics, 6,* 473-486.

Cullinan, B. E. (Ed.). (1987). *Children's literature in the reading program*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Edelsky, C., & Draper, K. (1989). *Authenticity: A purposeful notion*. Unpublished manuscript. Phoenix: Arizona State University.

Flood, J. (1986). The text, the student, and the teacher: Learning from exposition in middle schools. *Reading Teacher, 39,* 784-791.

London, J. (1989). *White Fang*. New York: Tor Books.

Newman, J. M. (1985). Using children's books to teach reading. In J. M. Newman (Ed.), *Whole language theory in use* (pp. 55-64). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Rosenblatt, L. M. (1978). *The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of the literary work*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Rosenblatt, L. M. (1980). "What facts does this poem teach you?" *Language Arts, 57,* 386-394.

Rosenblatt, L. M. (1983). The reading transaction: What for? In R. Parker & F. Davis (Eds.), *Developing literacy: Young children's use of language* (pp. 118-135). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Rosenblatt, L. M. (1985). Viewpoints: Transaction versus interaction--a terminological rescue operation. *Research in the Teaching of English, 19,* 96-107.

Rosenblatt, L. M. (1989). Writing and reading: The transactional theory. In J. M. Mason (Ed.), *Reading and writing connections* (pp. 153-176). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Stein, N. L., & Glenn, C. G. (1979). An analysis of story comprehension in elementary school children. In R. O. Freedle (Ed.), *New directions in discourse processing* (pp. 53-120). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Taylor, B. M., & Beach, R. W. (1984). The effects of text structure instruction on middle-grade students' comprehension and production of expository text. *Reading Research Quarterly, 21,* 134-146.

Watson, D. J. (1989). Defining and describing whole language. *Elementary School Journal, 90,* 129-141.

Author Note

A version of this report also appears in R. J. Kreuz & M. S. MacNealy (Eds.), *Empirical approaches to literature and aesthetics advances in discourse processes*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.